




federal courts by refusing to file his Rule 60(b)(6) motions without due process in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Plaintiff seeks \$35 million in damages and that he be allowed to file his Rule 60(b)(6) motions.

Magistrate Judge Webb, in his M&R of October 7, 2013, recommended that plaintiff's claims be dismissed as frivolous and that plaintiff be sanctioned \$350.

### DISCUSSION

The Court adopts the M&R because plaintiff has made no objections to it and because the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B). A district court is only required to review an M&R de novo if the plaintiff specifically objects to it or in cases of plain error. *Id.*; *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985). The magistrate has not committed plain error in this instance. Although plaintiff has filed what he terms to be a motion for summary judgment and objection, [DE 9], plaintiff fails to actually object to any specific points in Magistrate Judge Webb's M&R. Therefore, the Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's recommendations and DISMISSES plaintiff's complaint in its entirety and SANCTIONS plaintiff in the amount of \$350. Because plaintiff's case has been dismissed, his motion for summary judgment is DENIED AS MOOT and the clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close the file.

SO ORDERED, this 29 day of October, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRENCE W. BOYLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE